arXiv:1605.04449v3 [math.PR] 29 Aug 2016

Chemical distances for percolation of planar Gaussian free fields and critical random walk loop soups

Jian Ding* University of Chicago

Li Li* University of Chicago

Abstract

We initiate the study on chemical distances of percolation clusters for level sets of two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free fields as well as loop clusters generated by two-dimensional random walk loop soups. One of our results states that the chemical distance between two macroscopic annuli away from the boundary for the random walk loop soup at the critical intensity is of dimension 1 with positive probability. Our proof method is based on an interesting combination of a theorem of Makarov, isomorphism theory and an entropic repulsion estimate for Gaussian free fields in the presence of a hard wall.

1 Introduction

For an $N \times N$ box $V_N \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$ centered at the origin, we let the discrete Gaussian free field (GFF) $\{\eta_{N,v} : v \in V_N\}$ with Dirichlet boundary condition be a mean zero Gaussian process which takes value 0 on ∂V_N and has covariances given by

$$\mathbb{E}\eta_{N,v}\eta_{N,u} = \frac{1}{4} G_{V_N}(u,v)\,,$$

where $G_{V_N}(u,v)$ is the Green's function for simple random walk, i.e., the expected number of visits to v before exiting V_N for a simple random walk started at u. The first goal of the present paper is to study chemical distances (i.e., graph distances) on the percolation cluster for level sets of GFF. Precisely, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we let $\mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda} = \{v \in V_N : \eta_{N,v} \leqslant \lambda\}$ be the λ-level sets, i.e., the collection of all vertices with values no more than λ. In the context of no confusion, we also denote by $\mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda}$ the induced subgraph on $\mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda}$. For $u, v \in V_N$, we let $D_{N,\lambda}(u,v)$ be the graph distance between u and v if u, v are in the same connected component of $\mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda}$, and let $D_{N,\lambda}(u,v) = \infty$ otherwise. For $A, B \subseteq V_N$, we denote $D_{N,\lambda}(A,B) = \min_{u\in A, v\in B} D_{N,\lambda}(u,v)$.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, there exist constants $c > 0, \lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all N*

$$\mathbb{P}(D_{N,\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) \geqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}) \leqslant c^{-1}(\mathrm{e}^{-c\lambda^2} + N^{-20}),\ \textit{for all } \lambda \geqslant \lambda_0\,.$$

Remark 1.2. Note that even for any fixed $\lambda < 0$, the event $D_{N,\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ in Theorem 1.1 occurs with non-vanishing probability; see Corollary 3.5. In addition, we expect that for any fixed λ, the probability for $D_{N,\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) < \infty$ is strictly less than 1; we do not study this in the present paper so as not to dilute the focus.

*Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1455049 and Alfred Sloan fellowship.

We next consider the random walk loop soup introduced in [31], which is a discrete analogue of the Brownian loop soup [32]. For convenience, we follow [33] where the loops are endowed with a continuous-time parametrization. Formally, let (X_t) be a continuous-time sub-Markovian jump process on V_N which is killed at the boundary. Given two neighboring vertices x and y, let the transition rate from x to y be 1. Let $(\mathbb{P}^t_{x,y}(\cdot))_{x,y\in V_N,t>0}$ be the bridge probability measures of X conditioned on not killed until time t, and let $(p_t(x,y))_{x,y\in V_N,t\geqslant 0}$ be the transition probabilities of X. Then the measure μ on time-parametrized loops associated to X is, as defined in [33],

$$\mu(\cdot) = \sum_{x\in V_N} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}^t_{x,x}(\cdot)\frac{p_t(x,x)}{t}dt\,. \tag{1}$$

For $\alpha > 0$, the random walk loop soup with intensity α on V_N, denoted as $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,N}$, is defined to be the Poisson point process on the space of loops with intensity $\alpha\mu$. Naturally $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,N}$ induces a subgraph (which we also denote as $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,N}$) of $\mathcal{G}_N$ where an edge is open if it is contained in a loop in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,N}$. Our next theorem is on chemical distances (which we denote by $D_{\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}}(\cdot,\cdot)$) of such loop clusters at its critical intensity $\alpha_c = 1/2$.

Theorem 1.3. *For any $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all N*

$$\mathbb{P}(D_{\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}) \geqslant c\,.$$

Remark 1.4. We expect that the probability for $D_{\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) < \infty$ is strictly less than 1; see Remark 1.2.

1.1 Backgrounds and related works

Chemical distances for percolation models is a substantially more challenging problem than the question on connectivities. For instance, it is a major challenge to compute the exponent on the chemical distance between (say) the left and right boundaries for the critical planar percolation, conditioning on the existence of an open crossing. It was proved in [1] that the dimension is strictly larger than 1, and it was shown in recent works [13, 14] that the chemical distance is substantially smaller than the length of the lowest open crossing. Let us remark that the current result does not imply that the exponent for the chemical distance is strictly less than that of the lowest open crossing, despite that it was strongly believed so.

Due to the strong correlation and hierarchical nature of the two-dimensional GFF as well as the random walk loop soup, our model is perhaps in spirit more closely related to the fractal percolation process (see [11] for a survey). For fractal percolation process, it was proved [12, 41] that the dimension of the chemical distance is strictly larger than 1 (which suggests an interesting dichotomy in view of our dimension 1 results for the GFF and the random walk loop soup).

As for loop soups, in two-dimensions the connectivity of the loop clusters has been studied recently. In [45], it was shown that there is a phase transition around the critical intensity $\alpha_c = \frac{1}{2}$ for percolation of the Brownian loop soup, below which there are only bounded clusters and above which the loops forms a single cluster. In recent works of [35, 34], analogous results were proved for the random walk loop soup.

In three-dimensions or higher, there has been an intensive study on percolation of level sets for GFF, random walks, random interlacements as well as random walk loop soups; see, e.g., [46, 47, 43, 10]. In fact, much on the chemical distances for these percolation models has been

studied; see [8, 20, 9]. We remark that there is a drastic difference between two-dimensions and higher dimensions.

Besides chemical distances, other metric aspects of two-dimensional GFF has been studied recently: see [36] on the random pseudo-metric defined via the zero-set, and see [19, 17, 16, 18] for some progress on the first passage percolation on the exponential of these underlying fields.

Finally, the random walk loop soup percolation is naturally related to the following percolation dimension question for planar random walks (Brownian motion) proposed in [22, 6]. Run the random walk until it exits the boundary of a box and declare a vertex to be open if it is visited and closed otherwise. Then what is the dimension of the minimal open crossing from the origin to the boundary? We are currently not able to prove something for this question, for the crucial reason that we are not able to construct a coupling between GFFs and random walks under which an event on GFFs will certify "small" chemical distances for random walk percolation models.

1.2 Discussions on main proof ingredients

Our proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 are based on an interesting combination of a theorem of Makarov, isomorphism theory and an entropic repulsion estimate for GFF in the presence of hard wall. In this subsection, we will provide a brief review on these three ingredients.

A theorem of Makarov. A fundamental ingredient for our proofs, is a classical theorem of Makarov [38] which states that the dimension of the support for the harmonic measure on simply connected domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is 1. In this article, we will use a discrete analogue of Makarov's theorem which was proved in [28] by approximating Brownian motions with random walks (and then using [38]). Previous to [38], the Beurling's projection theorem (see, e.g., [3, Theorem V.4.1.], and see [25, 29] for its discrete analogue) was established, which gives an (achievable) upper bound on the maximal local expansion of the harmonic measure compared with 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure (in the language of simple random walk, it states that the harmonic measure at a lattice point on a simply connected curve of diameter n is bounded by $O(1/\sqrt{n})$). In a sense, Makarov's theorem states that the upper bound in Berling's estimate cannot be achieved globally, and thus providing a much better control (than that guaranteed by Beurling's projecting theorem) on the global expansion and compression of harmonic measure. Finally, we remark that examples have been given in [40, 7], in which the harmonic measure is *singular* to the 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure. In our opinion, this suggests that Question 1.4 below could be of serious challenge.

Isomorphism theory. The distribution of the occupation times for random walks can be fully characterized by Gaussian free fields; results of this flavor go by the name of isomorphism theorems (see [39, 33, 48, 44] for an excellent account on this topic). Of significance to the present article is the following version of isomorphism theorem between occupation times for random walk loop soups and Gaussian free fields shown in [33].

Recall the definition of random walk loop soups $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,N}$. We define the associated occupation time field $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^x_\alpha)_{x\in V_N}$ by

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^x_\alpha = \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,N}} \int_0^{T(\gamma)} \mathbf{1}_{\gamma(t)=x} dt$$

where $T(\gamma)$ is the duration of the loop γ. The isomorphism theorem in [33] states that

$$\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^x_{1/2} : x \in V_N\} \stackrel{law}{=} \{\frac{1}{2}\eta^2_{N,x} : x \in V_N\} \tag{2}$$

(Note that this holds for random walks in general graphs). Recently, couplings between random walks/random walk loop soups and Gaussian free fields have been developed in [35], where the signs of GFFs are incorporated in the coupling in order to provide certificate for vertices/edges not visited by random walks/random walks loop soups. The paper [35] was motivated by connectivity of the loop soup clusters as well as random interlacement. Independent of [35], such coupling was established for random walks in [51] with the application of deriving an exponential concentration for cover times. The work [51] was motivated by [15], where such coupling was proved for general trees and questioned for general graphs; the advance in [35] was independent of [15].

In fact, using the coupling derived in [35] only allows us to prove a version of Theorem 1.3 for Lupu's loop soup on the metric graph introduced in [35]; see Section 3 and in particular Theorem 3.1. In order to deal with the random walk loop soup, we will use a recent advancing on the *random current model* for random walk loop soups. A random current model on a graph, say $\mathcal{G}_N = (V_N, E_N)$ in our case, is the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ with

$$\mathbb{P}((n_e)_{e\in E_N}) \propto \prod_{e\in E_N} \frac{(\beta_e)^{n_e}}{n_e!}, \tag{3}$$

where $(n_e)_{e\in E_N}$ are nonnegative integers such that $\sum_{v\in e} n_e$ is even for any $v \in V_N$, and $(\beta_e)_{e\in E_N}$ are positive parameters on E_N. Conditioning on $\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^v_{1/2} = \ell_v\}_{v\in V_N}$, let $(n_e)_{e\in E_N}$ be a random current model with parameters $\beta_e = 2\sqrt{\ell_x \ell_y}$ on edge $e = (x, y)$.

It was shown in [50, 37] and [26, Theorem 1] that conditioning on the local times the distribution of $(n_e)_{e\in E_N}$ is the same as that of the number of jumps of the random walk loop soup $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$ along each $e \in E_N$, and therefore $(1_{n_e>0})_{e\in E_N}$ has the same distribution as the graph induced by $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$ on V_N.

We remark that the random current representation played a crucial role in a recent work [2] which proved the continuity of spontaneous magnetization for the three-dimensional Ising model at the critical temperature. Finally, we remark that the random Eulerian graph model considered in [15] (which was used to reconstruct the number of visits to vertices from the continuous occupation times) was of high resemblance of the random current model.

Entropic repulsions. Unlike the Lupu's loop soup, the clusters for the critical random walk loop soup is strictly dominated by the sign clusters of the GFF on the metric graph. In order to address this, we apply the aforementioned random current model and see that the loop clusters dominates a generalized sign cluster on the metric graph, where we replace each original edge (which can be viewed as a unit resistor) by two edges and assign the conductances so that it sums to 1. This is summarized in Lemma 4.1. When employing the proof idea of Theorem 3.1, we encounter a problem which amounts to bound the typical value of a GFF under the conditioning of staying positive in a subset. Results of this type, on such entropic repulsions for two-dimensional GFFs under the presence of hard wall, has been obtained in [21, 4]. Our set up is slightly more complicated (and somewhat non-standard), and dealing with it forms the main technical ingredient in Section 4. As standard in this type of problems, our proof crucially relies on the FKG inequality [23, 42] and the Brascamp-Lieb inequality [5].

1.3 Open problems

Our results motivate a number of interesting questions, as we list below.

Question 1.1. *For the random walk loop soup in the supercritical regime (i.e., with intensity strictly larger than $\frac{1}{2}$), is the dimension of the chemical distance 1 with high probability?*

Question 1.2. *Can one prove an analogous result for Brownian loop soups?*

Next, we will ask a number of questions in the context of level set percolation for GFF, but one can ask natural analogous questions for loop soups as well as random walks. We feel that, perhaps the questions regarding to GFF may be answered before that on random walks.

Question 1.3. *Under assumptions of Theorem 1.1, is the dimension of chemical distance 1 with high probability conditioned on the existence of an open crossing?*

Question 1.4. *Under assumptions of Theorem 1.1, is the length of minimal open crossing $O(n)$ with positive probability?*

Question 1.5. *Under assumptions of Theorem 1.1, is the number of disjoint open crossings tight?*

Finally, we pose a question regarding to universality of Theorem 1.1, whose difficulty is due to the crucial role of Makarov's theorem (which seems to only apply for GFF) in the proof of Theorem 1.1. In fact, we choose to keep an open mind on whether such universality holds, in light of a non-universality result in [19].

Question 1.6. *Does an analogous result to Theorem 1.1 hold for all log-correlated Gaussian fields?*

2 Percolation for Gaussian free fields

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. For notation convenience, we say a vertex v is λ-open (or open if no risk of confusion) if $v \in \mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda}$, and λ-closed (or closed) otherwise. For any $A, B \subseteq V_N$, we denote by $A \overset{\leqslant\lambda}{\longleftrightarrow} B$ the event that there exists a λ-open path P connecting A and B, i.e., $D_{N,\lambda}(A, B) < \infty$.

2.1 One-arm estimate: a warm up argument

In this subsection, we give a warm up argument on level set percolation for GFF. Despite being rather simple, the argument is a clear demonstration of the fundamental idea of the paper, which allows to take advantage of the Markov field property in studying percolations. We remark that a similar argument was employed in [49, Section 3].

Proposition 2.1. *For any $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\partial V_{\alpha N} \overset{\leqslant\lambda}{\longleftrightarrow} \partial V_{\beta N}) \geqslant 1 - 2\mathrm{e}^{-c\lambda^2}\,.$$

Proof. By duality, the complement of the event $\{\partial V_{\alpha N} \overset{\leqslant\lambda}{\longleftrightarrow} \partial V_{\beta N}\}$ is the same as the event that there exists a λ-closed contour $\mathcal{C} \subseteq V_{\beta N}$ surrounding $V_{\alpha N}$. We let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the collection of all such contours. It suffices to estimate $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{C} \neq \emptyset)$.

To this end, we consider a natural partial order on all contours. For any contour $\mathcal{C}$, we let $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ be the collection of vertices that are surrounded by $\mathcal{C}$. For two contours $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$, we say $\mathcal{C}_1 \leqslant \mathcal{C}_2$ if $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_1 \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_2$. A key observation is that this partial order generates a well-defined (unique) global

minimum on $\mathfrak{C}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{C}^*$. Furthermore, for any contour $\mathcal{C} \subseteq V_{\beta N}$ surrounding $V_{\alpha N}$, we have

$$\{\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}} \triangleq \sigma(\{\eta_{N,v} : v \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}\}) . \tag{4}$$

Define

$$X = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \eta_{N,v} . \tag{5}$$

We will need the following standard estimates on simple random walks; we include a proof merely for completeness.

Lemma 2.2. *For any fixed $0 < r < 1$, there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ which depend on r such that*

$$\sum_{v \in \partial V_{rN}} G_{V_N}(u, v) \leqslant c_1 N, \quad \forall u \in \partial V_{rN} \tag{6}$$

and

$$G_{V_N}(u, v) \geqslant c_2, \quad \forall u, v \in V_{rN} . \tag{7}$$

Furthermore, for any $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, there exists a constant $c_3 > 0$ such that for all $u \in \partial V_{\beta N}$, the simple random walk started at u will hit $\partial V_{\alpha N}$ before ∂V_N with probability at least c_3.

Proof. For convenience we assume that V_N is centered at the origin. Let $S_n = (S_{1,n}, S_{2,n})$ be a simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. It is clear that if S is on ∂V_{rN} at some point, in the next step it will move to some vertex on ∂V_{rN+1} with probability at least $1/4$, and after that, it will hit ∂V_N before ∂V_{rN} with probability at least $\frac{1}{(1-r)N}$ (since $\max\{|S_{1,n}|, |S_{2,n}|\}$ is a submartingale). Therefore, a simple random walk started at any $u \in \partial V_{rN}$ will in expectation visit ∂V_{rN} at most $4(1-r)N$ times before hitting ∂V_N. This proves our first bound (6).

For the second bound (7), let $\varepsilon = \frac{1-r}{100}$. Denote by $u = (u_1, u_2)$ and $v = (v_1, v_2)$. By independence of the simple random walks in x and y-coordinates, there exists $c' = c'(r)$ such that with probability at least c' the simple random walk started at u will hit some point v^* in the vertical line $x = v_1$ before exiting V_N or before the y-coordinate deviates by more than εN; started from v^*, there is again probability at least c' for the simple random walk to hit the horizontal line $y = v_2$ before the horizontal coordinate deviates by more than εN. Altogether, there is probability at least $(c')^2$ for the random walk to hit the ℓ_∞-ball of radius εN around v before exiting V_N. At this point, an application of [30, Proposition 4.6.2, Theorem 4.4.4.] completes the verification of (7).

The last statement of lemma was implicitly proved in the above derivation of (7). □

As a simple corollary of (6), there exists a constant $c_4 > 0$ which depends on β such that

$$\operatorname{Var} X = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|^2} \sum_{u,v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N}(u, v) \leqslant c_4 \tag{8}$$

and thus we also have $\operatorname{Var}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}) \leqslant c_4$. By the Markov property of the GFF, we have for each $v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$

$$\mathbb{E}(\eta_{N,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{C}} \operatorname{Hm}(v, u; \mathcal{C} \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \eta_{N,u} . \tag{9}$$

Here for a set A, we use $\operatorname{Hm}(v, u; A)$ to denote the harmonic measure at u with respect to starting point v and the target set A (i.e., $\operatorname{Hm}(v, u; A) = \mathbb{P}_v(S_{\tau_A} = u)$, where (S_n) is a simple random walk

on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and τ_A is the first time it hits set A). We further denote by $\mathrm{Hm}(v, B; A) = \sum_{u\in B} \mathrm{Hm}(v, u; A)$. Now on the event $\{\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}\}$, we have $\eta_{N,u} \geqslant \lambda$ for all $u \in \mathcal{C}$. Combined with Lemma 2.2, it gives that

$$\mathbb{E}(\eta_{N,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}) \geqslant \lambda \mathrm{Hm}(v, \mathcal{C}; \mathcal{C} \cup \partial V_N) \geqslant \lambda \mathrm{Hm}(v, \partial V_{\alpha N}; \partial V_{\alpha N} \cup \partial V_N) \geqslant c_3\lambda\,. \tag{10}$$

Therefore, we have $\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}) \geqslant c_3\lambda$ on the event $\{\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}\}$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}) \geqslant 1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant c_3\lambda/2) \text{ on the event } \{\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}\}\,,$$

where we denote by $Z(c_4)$ a mean zero Gaussian variable with variance c_4. Since $\{\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2 \mid \mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}) \geqslant 1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant c_3\lambda/2)\,.$$

Summing this over all possible contours $\mathcal{C} \subseteq V_{\beta N}$ surrounding $V_{\alpha N}$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2 \mid \mathfrak{C} \neq \emptyset) \geqslant 1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant c_3\lambda/2)\,.$$

Combined with the simple fact that

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2) \leqslant \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant c_3\lambda/2) \tag{11}$$

it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{C} \neq \emptyset) \leqslant \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2)}{\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2 \mid \mathfrak{C} \neq \emptyset)} \leqslant \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant c_3\lambda/2)}{1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant c_3\lambda/2)}\,.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Consider $\lambda > 0$. Our goal is to provide a lower bound on the probability that there exists a λ-open path with length less than $N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ connecting $\partial V_{\alpha N}$ and $\partial V_{\beta N}$. Therefore we may restrict our attention to λ-open paths connecting $\partial V_{\alpha N}$ and $\partial V_{\beta N}$ that do not touch the interior of $V_{\alpha N}$ or $V_N \setminus V_{\beta N}$. This motivates the following exploration procedure. We set $\mathcal{A}_0 = \partial V_{\alpha N} \cap \mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda}$, $\mathcal{B}_0 = \partial V_{\alpha N} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda}$, $\mathcal{C}_0 = \partial V_{\alpha N}$, and for $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, we define inductively

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{i+1} &= \{v \in ((V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}) \setminus \mathcal{C}_i) \cap H_{N,\lambda} : v \sim u \text{ for some } u \in \mathcal{A}_i\}\,,\\
\mathcal{B}_{i+1} &= \{v \in ((V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}) \setminus \mathcal{C}_i) \setminus H_{N,\lambda} : v \sim u \text{ for some } u \in \mathcal{A}_i\} \cup \mathcal{B}_i\,,\\
\mathcal{C}_{i+1} &= \cup_{j=0}^{i+1} \mathcal{A}_j \cup \mathcal{B}_{i+1}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, $\mathcal{C}_i$ records all the vertices that have been explored before (or at) stage i. At stage $i+1$, we check all the neighbors of $\mathcal{A}_i$ that is in $V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}$ and has not been explored: if the vertex is in $\mathcal{H}_{N,\lambda}$ then we put it to $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}$, otherwise we put it to $\mathcal{B}_{i+1}$. It is clear that $\mathcal{A}_i$ records all the vertices in $V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}$ that are of chemical distance i to $\partial V_{\alpha N}$, and $\mathcal{B}_i$ records all the closed vertices we have encountered. Furthermore, we observe that

- $\mathcal{A}_i$'s are disjoint from each other.
- $\mathcal{C}_i$ is a connected set in $V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}$.
- $\partial\mathcal{C}_i$ (the boundary points of $\mathcal{C}_i$) is a subset of $\mathcal{A}_i \cup \mathcal{B}_i \cup \mathcal{A}_0$.

- Let $\mathcal{C}_i' \triangleq \{u : \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, u; \mathcal{C}_i) > 0\}$. Then $\mathcal{C}_i' \subseteq \partial \mathcal{C}_i$ and $\mathcal{C}_i' \cap \mathcal{A}_0 = \emptyset$, so that $\mathcal{C}_i' \subseteq \mathcal{A}_i \cup \mathcal{B}_i$.

Now suppose that the event $\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{D_{N,\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) \geqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}\}$ occurs, then we must have that $\mathcal{C}_i$ is disjoint from $V_N \setminus V_{\beta N}$ for all $0 \leqslant i < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$. Further, since $\mathcal{A}_i$'s are disjoint from each other, we see (from a simple volume consideration) that there exists at least an $i_0 < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ such that

$$|\mathcal{A}_{i_0}| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}. \tag{12}$$

We let τ be the minimal number i_0 which satisfies (12). In summary, we have

$$\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{E}' \triangleq \bigsqcup_{\substack{0 \leqslant k < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}} \\ (A_0, \dots A_k, B_0, \dots B_k) \in \mathcal{P}_k}} \{\tau = k\} \cap \{\mathcal{A}_i = A_i, \mathcal{B}_i = B_i \text{ for } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k\} \tag{13}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_k$ indicates all $(A_0, \dots A_k, B_0, \dots B_k)$ that are compatible with $\mathcal{E}$ and $\{\tau = k\} \cap \{\mathcal{A}_i = A_i, \mathcal{B}_i = B_i \text{ for } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k\}$. In particular, they should satisfy:

- Denote $C_k \triangleq \cup_{i=0}^k A_i \cup B_k$. Then C_k is a connected set in $V_{\beta N} \setminus V_{\alpha N}$.
- Denote $C_k' \triangleq \{u : \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, u; C_k) > 0\}$. Then $C_k' \subseteq A_k \cup B_k$.
- $|A_k| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}$.

Now we fix any $0 \leqslant k < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ and any $(A_0, \dots A_k, B_0, \dots B_k) \in \mathcal{P}_k$. It is not hard to verify that

$$\{\tau = k\} \cap \{\mathcal{A}_i = A_i, \mathcal{B}_i = B_i \text{ for } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k\} \in \mathcal{F}_{C_k}. \tag{14}$$

Conditioning on $\mathcal{F}_{C_k}$, the field $\{\eta_{N,v} : v \in V_N \setminus C_k\}$ is again distributed as a GFF. In particular, for each $v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\eta_{N,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{C_k}) = \sum_{u \in C_k} \mathrm{Hm}(v, u; C_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \eta_{N,u}. \tag{15}$$

Since $C_k \subseteq V_{\beta N} \setminus V_{\alpha N}$, we have from Lemma 2.2

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, C_k; C_k \cup \partial V_N) \geqslant \mathrm{Hm}(v, \partial V_{\alpha N}; \partial V_{\alpha N} \cup \partial V_N) \geqslant c_3. \tag{16}$$

In addition, we have that

$$\{u \in C_k : \mathrm{Hm}(v, u; C_k \cup \partial V_N) > 0\} = \{u : \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, u; C_k) > 0\} = C_k' \subseteq A_k \cup B_k. \tag{17}$$

We want to show that $\mathrm{Hm}(v, A_k; C_k \cup \partial V_N)$ is small. First, we note that

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, A_k; C_k \cup \partial V_N) \leqslant \mathrm{Hm}(v, A_k; C_k). \tag{18}$$

By a combination of Theorem 1.7.6 (Harnack principle), Theorem 2.1.3 and Exercise 2.1.4 in [27], we have for constants $c_6, c_7, c_8 > 0$ which depend on β, any $u \in C_k$ and arbitrary $w \in \partial V_{20N}$

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, u; C_k) \leqslant c_6 \mathrm{Hm}(w, u; C_k) \leqslant c_7 \mathrm{Hm}(8N, u; C_k) \leqslant c_8 \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, u; C_k),$$

where $\mathrm{Hm}(8N, u; C_k)$ corresponds to the $H_A^m(y)$ in [27, Theorem 2.1.3] with $A = C_k$, $m = 8N$ and $y = u$. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, A_k; C_k) \leqslant c_8 \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, A_k; C_k)\,. \tag{19}$$

Since C_k is a connected set of radius between $(\alpha/2)N$ and $2N$, by [28, Proposition 4.1] we deduce that for constants $c_9, c_{10} > 0$ depending only on α

$$\mathrm{Hm}(\infty, \{u \in C_k : \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, u; C_k) > c_9 N^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{4/5}}\}; C_k) \leqslant c_{10} (\log N)^{-20}\,.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Hm}(\infty, A_k; C_k) &= \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, A_k \cap \{u \in C_k : \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, u; C_k) \leqslant c_9 N^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{4/5}}\}; C_k) \\
&\quad + \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, A_k \cap \{u \in C_k : \mathrm{Hm}(\infty, u; C_k) > c_9 N^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{4/5}}\}; C_k) \\
&\leqslant (c_9 N^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{4/5}}) \cdot N \mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}} + c_{10} (\log N)^{-20} \\
&= o(\log N)^{-10}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Combining (18), (19) and (20), we finally have

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, A_k; C_k \cup \partial V_N) = o(\log N)^{-10}\,. \tag{21}$$

Combined with (16) and (17), it yields that

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, B_k; C_k \cup \partial V_N) \geqslant c_3 - o(\log N)^{-10}\,.$$

Now on the event $\{\tau = k\} \cap \{\mathcal{A}_i = A_i, \mathcal{B}_i = B_i \text{ for } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k\}$, we have by definition that $\eta_{N,u} \geqslant \lambda$ for all $u \in B_k$, so we can derive from (15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\eta_{N,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{C_k}) &= \sum_{u \in C_k} \mathrm{Hm}(v, u; C_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \eta_{N,u} \\
&= \sum_{u \in A_k} \mathrm{Hm}(v, u; C_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \eta_{N,u} + \sum_{u \in B_k} \mathrm{Hm}(v, u; C_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \eta_{N,u} \\
&\geqslant (c_3 - o((\log N)^{-10}))\lambda - o((\log N)^{-10}) \sup_{u \in V_N} |\eta_{N,u}|\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}} = \{\sup_{u \in V_N} |\eta_{N,u}| \geqslant 100 \log N\}$. By a straightforward computation, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}) \leqslant N^{-20}\,. \tag{22}$$

We can assume without loss that Λ_{bad} does not occur. To be precise, for sufficiently large N, on the event $\{\tau = k\} \cap \{\mathcal{A}_i = A_i, \mathcal{B}_i = B_i \text{ for } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k\} \setminus \Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\eta_{N,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{C_k}) \geqslant 9c_3\lambda/10\,.$$

Recall the definition of X in (5). Then on the same event, we have $\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{C_k}) \geqslant 9c_3\lambda/10$ and $\mathrm{Var}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{C_k}) \leqslant \mathrm{Var}\, X \leqslant c_4$. Thus (still on the same event),

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{C_k}) \geqslant 1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant 2c_3\lambda/5)\,,$$

where $Z(c_4)$ is a mean zero Gaussian variable with variance c_4. By (14), this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2, \tau = k, \mathcal{A}_i = A_i, \mathcal{B}_i = B_i \text{ for } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k) \\ = \; & \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{C_k})\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=k\}\cap\{\mathcal{A}_i=A_i,\mathcal{B}_i=B_i \text{ for } 0\leqslant i\leqslant k\}}) \\ \geqslant \; & (1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant 2c_3\lambda/5))\mathbb{P}(\{\tau = k\} \cap \{\mathcal{A}_i = A_i, \mathcal{B}_i = B_i \text{ for } 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k\} \setminus \Lambda_{\text{bad}}) . \end{aligned}$$

Summing this over all $0 \leqslant k < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ and all $(A_0, \dots A_k, B_0, \dots B_k) \in \mathcal{P}_k$ and using (13), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2) \geqslant (1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant 2c_3\lambda/5))\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}' \setminus \Lambda_{\text{bad}}) .$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leqslant \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}') &\leqslant \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}' \setminus \Lambda_{\text{bad}}) + \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{\text{bad}}) \\ &\leqslant \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \geqslant c_3\lambda/2)}{1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant 2c_3\lambda/5)} + \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{\text{bad}}) \\ &\leqslant \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant c_3\lambda/2)}{1 - \mathbb{P}(Z(c_4) \geqslant 2c_3\lambda/5)} + \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{\text{bad}}) . \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (22), this completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3 Percolation of the continuous loop soup

In this section we prove an analogous result to Theorem 1.3 for the continuous loop soups defined on the *metric graph* of $\mathcal{G}_N = (V_N, E_N)$ at critical intensity $1/2$. The result in this section will not be used in the derivation of Theorem 1.3. However, our proof method of Theorem 1.3 is hugely inspired by the consideration of the continuous loop soup. Therefore, we include the present section, with the hope of conveying the source of insight.

The continuous loop soup as well as the Gaussian free field on the metric graph were considered in [35]. We follow the setup and definitions there. We let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$ be the metric graph (or the cable system) of $\mathcal{G}_N$ where each edge in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$ has length $\frac{1}{2}$. On $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$ we can define a standard Brownian motion $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}$, so that $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}$ when restricted to V_N is the same as the aforementioned continuous-time sub-Markovian jump process (X_t). Let $G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}(u, v)$ be the Green's function of $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}$, so that for $u, v \in V_N$, $G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}(u, v) = \frac{1}{4}G_{V_N}(u, v)$, the Green's function of (X_t). Let $\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N\}$ be the Gaussian free field on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$ with covariance function $G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}(u, v)$. Then the restriction of $\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N\}$ to V_N is the same as the Gaussian free field $\{\eta_{N,v} : v \in V_N\}$. Moreover, $\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N\}$ can be obtained from $\{\eta_{N,v} : v \in V_N\}$ by (for each edge $e = (u, v)$) independently sampling a variance 2 Brownian bridge of length $\frac{1}{2}$ with values $\eta_{N,u}$ and $\eta_{N,v}$ at the endpoints. In particular, as shown in [35] $\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N\}$ has a continuous realization.

Now we can associate to $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}$ a measure $\tilde{\mu}_N$ on continuous loops in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$, and for each $\alpha > 0$ consider the continuous loop soup $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,N}$ which is a Poisson point process with intensity $\alpha\tilde{\mu}_N$. The loops of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,N}$ may be partitioned into clusters. For $u, v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$, we define the chemical distance of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,N}$ between u and v by

$$D_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,N}}(u, v) = \min_{\gamma} |\gamma| ,$$

where the minimum is over all path $\gamma \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$ joining u and v that stays within a cluster of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,N}$.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all N*

$$\mathbb{P}(D_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1/2,N}}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}) \geqslant c\,.$$

Remark 3.2. We expect that the probability for $D_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1/2,N}}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) < \infty$ is strictly less than 1; see Remark 1.2.

By [35, Proposition 2.1], there is a coupling between $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1/2,N}$ and a continuous version of $\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N\}$ such that the clusters of loops of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1/2,N}$ are exactly the sign clusters of $\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N\}$. In light of this, define

$$D_{\tilde{\eta}_N}(u, v) = \min_{\gamma} |\gamma|\,,$$

where the minimum is over all path $\gamma \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$ joining u and v such that $\tilde{\eta}_{N,\gamma}$ are of the same sign (plus or minus). In order to prove Theorem 3.1, it suffices to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *For any $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all N*

$$\mathbb{P}(D_{\tilde{\eta}_N}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}) \geqslant c\,.$$

Proof. For a compact connected set $K \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$ and any $v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N \setminus K$, let $T_{K\cup\partial V_N, v}$ be the first time the Brownian motion $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}$ started at v hits $K \cup \partial V_N$. It is clear that $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}_{T_{K\cup\partial V_N, v}}$ can only take on finitely many values u in $K \cup \partial V_N$. Therefore for such $u \in K \cup \partial V_N$ we can define

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(v, u; K \cup \partial V_N) \triangleq \mathbb{P}^v(B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}_{T_{K\cup\partial V_N, v}} = u)$$

(and set $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(v, u; K \cup \partial V_N) = 0$ otherwise) to be the harmonic measure of $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}$ at u with respect to starting point v and target set $K \cup \partial V_N$.

Our proof strategy is similar to that of Theorem 1.1. Consider the following exploration procedure on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N$. Let $\mathcal{A}_0 = \partial V_{\alpha N}$, $\mathcal{B}_0 = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0 = \partial\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\alpha N}$. For $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, at stage $(i + 1)$

- We set initially $\mathcal{A}_{i+1} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{B}_{i+1} = \mathcal{B}_i$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{i+1} = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$.
- If $\mathcal{A}_i = \emptyset$, stop. Otherwise, for each $v \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and every edge $e = (v, u)$ incident to v, if $u \in V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}$ and the neighborhood of v along e does not belong to $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$, we go (explore) from v along e to u until we reach a zero for $\{\tilde{\eta}_N\}$. In the case no zero is reached, we add all the points in e into $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{i+1}$ and add u, if it is not already in $\cup_{j=0}^{i}\mathcal{A}_j$, into $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}$; in the case that the first zero is reached at $w \in e$, we add all the points between v and w into $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{i+1}$ and add w into $\mathcal{B}_{i+1}$.

In summary, $\mathcal{A}_i$ records all the lattice points in $V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}$ that are of chemical distance (under $D_{\tilde{\eta}_N}$) i to $\partial V_{\alpha N}$; $\mathcal{B}_i$ records all the zeros reached in the exploration procedure up to stage i; $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ records all the points that have been explored (including the internal points of edges) up to stage i.

It is clear from the construction that

- $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ is a compact connected set in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\alpha N}$.
- $\mathcal{A}_i$'s are disjoint from each other. $\cup_{j=0}^{i}\mathcal{A}_j$ is exactly the set of all the lattice points in $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$.

- $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ (the boundary points of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$) is a subset of $\mathcal{A}_i \cup \mathcal{B}_i \cup \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0$.
- Let $\mathcal{C}_i \triangleq \{u : \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(\infty, u; \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i) > 0\}$. Then $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \partial\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ and $\mathcal{C}_i \cap \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0 = \emptyset$, so that $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathcal{A}_i \cup \mathcal{B}_i$.

Suppose that the event $\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{D_{\tilde{\eta}_N}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) > N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}\}$ occurs, then $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ must be a subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\beta N} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\alpha N}$ for all $0 \leqslant i < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$. Further, let τ be the minimal number i_0 which satisfies

$$|\mathcal{A}_{i_0}| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}.$$

Then since $\mathcal{A}_i$'s are disjoint from each other, we have $\tau < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ on the event $\mathcal{E}$.

Conditioning on $\mathcal{F}_\tau \triangleq \sigma(\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau\})$, by the strong Markov property in [35, Section 3], $\{\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau\}$ is distributed as a mean zero GFF in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau$ plus the harmonic extension of $\tilde{\eta}_{N,v}$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau$. In particular, on the event $\mathcal{E}$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau$ is contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\beta N} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\alpha N}$, we have for each $v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau) = \sum_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(v, u; \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}_{N,u} = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{C}_\tau} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(v, u; \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}_{N,u}. \tag{23}$$

By definition we know that $\tilde{\eta}_{N,u} = 0$ for all $u \in \mathcal{B}_\tau$. Thus

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{B}_\tau} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(v, u; \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}_{N,u} = 0. \tag{24}$$

We want to show that $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(v, \mathcal{A}_\tau; \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau \cup \partial V_N)$ is small. Let $\mathcal{D}_\tau = \cup_{j=0}^{\tau} \mathcal{A}_j$ be the set of all the lattice points in $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau$. Then $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ contains $\mathcal{A}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 (= \partial V_{\alpha N})$ by definition, and it is a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{G}_N$. Since $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ is a subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau$, and the print of $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N}$ on V_N is the same as the simple random walk on V_N, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}(v, \mathcal{A}_\tau; \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau \cup \partial V_N) \leqslant \mathrm{Hm}(v, \mathcal{A}_\tau; \mathcal{D}_\tau \cup \partial V_N). \tag{25}$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau$ is contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\beta N} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\alpha N}$. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ is a connected set in $V_{\beta N} \setminus V_{\alpha N}$ of radius between $(\alpha/2)N$ and $2N$. Moreover $|\mathcal{A}_\tau| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}$. Therefore by (21), we have

$$\mathrm{Hm}(v, \mathcal{A}_\tau; \mathcal{D}_\tau \cup \partial V_N) = o(\log N)^{-10}. \tag{26}$$

Let $\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}} = \{\sup_{u \in V_N} |\tilde{\eta}_{N,u}| \geqslant 100 \log N\}$ be as before. Then on the event $\mathcal{E} \setminus \Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}$, combining (23), (24), (25) and (26) gives

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}_{N,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau) = o(\log N)^{-8}$$

and therefore

$$|\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau)| = o(\log N)^{-8} < \varepsilon$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large N. Now

$$\mathrm{Var}\, X = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|^2} \sum_{u,v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N}(u, v)$$

and on the event $\mathcal{E}$,

$$\mathrm{Var}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau) = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|^2} \sum_{u,v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\tau}(u, v)$$

$$\leqslant \frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|^2}\sum_{u,v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N\setminus V_{\alpha N}}(u,v)\,.$$

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant $c_{11}>0$ which depends on α and β such that*

$$\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|^2}\Big(\sum_{u,v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N}(u,v)-\sum_{u,v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N\setminus V_{\alpha N}}(u,v)\Big)\geqslant c_{11}\,. \tag{27}$$

Proof. We consider two scenarios where in scenario (1) we kill the random walk upon hitting ∂V_N and in scenario (2) we kill the random walk upon hitting $\partial V_{\alpha N}\cup\partial V_N$. For any $u\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$, we will compare the expected number of visits to $\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$ of a simple random walk started at u in these two scenarios. On the event E that it hits ∂V_N before $\partial V_{\alpha N}$, it will visit $\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$ the same number of times in both scenarios (1) and (2). On the complement of E (i.e. it hits $\partial V_{\alpha N}$ before ∂V_N), however, it will come back to some $w\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$, and will then (conditionally in expectation) visit $\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$ exactly $\sum_{v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N}(w,v)$ more times in scenario (1) than in scenario (2). Since we have a uniform lower bound of $\sum_{v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N}(w,v)$ (by (7)) and that $\mathbb{P}(E^c)\geqslant c_3$ by Lemma 2.2, we see that

$$\sum_{v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N}(u,v)-\sum_{v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} G_{V_N\setminus V_{\alpha N}}(u,v)\geqslant c_3c_2|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|\,,$$

and (27) follows by summing this over all $u\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$. □

Therefore we have $\operatorname{Var}X-\operatorname{Var}(X\mid\mathcal{F}_\tau)\geqslant c_{11}$ on the event $\mathcal{E}$ by (27) and also recall that $\operatorname{Var}X\leqslant c_4$ by (8). Now let $t=\varepsilon+s\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11}}$ where $s>0$ is a constant to be chosen later. Since given $\mathcal{F}_\tau$, X is Gaussian, we have on the event $\mathcal{E}\setminus\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}$

$$\mathbb{P}(X\leqslant t\mid\mathcal{F}_\tau)\geqslant\mathbb{P}(Z(\varepsilon,\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11})\leqslant t)=\mathbb{P}(Z\leqslant s)\,,$$

where $Z(\varepsilon,\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11})$ is a Gaussian variable with mean ε and variance $\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11}$, and Z is a standard Gaussian variable. In addition, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X\leqslant t)=\mathbb{P}(Z\leqslant\frac{\varepsilon+s\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X}})\,.$$

Since $c_{11}\leqslant\operatorname{Var}X\leqslant c_4$, we have $0\leqslant\frac{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X}}\leqslant\frac{\sqrt{c_4-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{c_4}}<1$, so

$$\frac{\varepsilon+s\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X}}\leqslant\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{c_{11}}}+s\frac{\sqrt{c_4-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{c_4}}\leqslant s(\frac{\frac{\sqrt{c_4-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{c_4}}+1}{2})$$

for a sufficiently large constant $s>0$. Therefore (recalling $\frac{\sqrt{c_4-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{c_4}}<1$)

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}\setminus\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}})\leqslant\frac{\mathbb{P}(Z\leqslant\frac{\varepsilon+s\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}X}})}{\mathbb{P}(Z\leqslant s)}\leqslant\frac{\mathbb{P}(Z\leqslant s(\frac{\frac{\sqrt{c_4-c_{11}}}{\sqrt{c_4}}+1}{2}))}{\mathbb{P}(Z\leqslant s)}<1\,.$$

Combined with (22), this completes the proof of the proposition. □

Finally, we remark that, using an almost identical proof of Proposition 3.3, we can prove the following result.

Corollary 3.5. *For all $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ and $\lambda > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all N*

$$\mathbb{P}(D_{N,-\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}) \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}) \geqslant c\,.$$

4 Percolation of the random walk loop soup

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3, into which the three main proof ingredients merge. Recall that as stated in (2), the occupation time field $\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^v_{1/2}\}_{v\in V_N}$ of $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$ has the same law as $\{\frac{1}{2}\eta^2_{N,v}\}_{v\in V_N}$; and as stated around (3), conditioning on $\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^v_{1/2} = \ell_v\}_{v\in V_N}$, the graph of $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$ has the same law as $(1_{n_e>0})_{e\in E_N}$, where $(n_e)_{e\in E_N}$ follows the random current model (see (3)) with parameters $\beta_e = 2\sqrt{\ell_x\ell_y}$ on edge $e = (x, y)$.

Each edge of $\mathcal{G}_N = (V_N, E_N)$ has conductance 1. In this section we will consider a graph $\mathcal{G}'_N = (V_N, E_N(1) \cup E_N(2))$, where we replace each edge $e \in E_N$ in the graph $\mathcal{G}_N$ by two multiple edges $e(1)$ and $e(2)$ and assign conductance $1/8$ to $e(1)$ and conductance $7/8$ to $e(2)$, and we denote $E_N(1) = \{e(1) : e \in E_N\}$ and $E_N(2) = \{e(2) : e \in E_N\}$. The graph $\mathcal{G}'_N$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{G}_N$ in the sense that the Gaussian free fields on $\mathcal{G}_N$ and $\mathcal{G}'_N$ have the same law.

As in [35], we will consider the Gaussian free field on the metric graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$ of $\mathcal{G}'_N$. The metric graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{G}'_N$ by assigning each edge $e(1) \in E_N(1)$ length 4 and each edge $e(2) \in E_N(2)$ length $7/4$. Let $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ be a standard Brownian motion on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$, let $G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}(u, v)$ be the Green's function of $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$, and let $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\}$ be a continuous realization of the Gaussian free field on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$ with covariances given by $G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}(u, v)$. The restriction of $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\}$ to V_N is the same as the Gaussian free field $\{\eta_{N,v} : v \in V_N\}$. Moreover, $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\}$ can be obtained from $\{\eta_{N,v} : v \in V_N\}$ by, for each edge $e' = (x, y) \in E_N(1) \cup E_N(2)$, independently sampling a variance 2 Brownian bridge of the same length as e' with values $\eta_{N,x}$ and $\eta_{N,y}$ at the endpoints.

We now describe a coupling between the random walk loop soup cluster $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$ and a graph $\mathcal{O}$ obtained from $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} : v \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\}$. Fix some $\lambda > 0$. We say an edge $e \in E_N$ is *open* if $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} > \lambda$ for all $v \in e(1)$ (which we denote as $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)} > \lambda$ for notation convenience, and the similar applies to the case of $< -\lambda$) or $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} < -\lambda$ for all $v \in e(1)$. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the graph (seen as a subgraph of $\mathcal{G}_N = (V_N, E_N)$) induced by these open edges.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\lambda \geqslant 2$, the graph $\mathcal{O}$ is stochastically dominated by $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$. That is to say, $(1_{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)}>\lambda \text{ or } \tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)}<-\lambda})_{e\in E_N}$ is stochastically dominated by $(1_{n_e>0})_{e\in E_N}$.*

Proof. Since $\{\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v})^2\}_{v\in V_N}$ and $\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^v_{1/2}\}_{v\in V_N}$ both have the same law as $\{\frac{1}{2}\eta^2_{N,v}\}_{v\in V_N}$, we only need to show the stochastic dominance of $\mathcal{O}$ when conditioned on the former, by $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$ when conditioned on the latter (with the same realization).

On one hand, conditioning on $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}\}_{v\in V_N}$ we see that $1_{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)}>\lambda \text{ or } \tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)}<-\lambda}$'s are independent Bernoulli variables with mean p_e's, where (we let (B_t) be a Brownian motion with variance 2 at time 1)

$$p_e = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(B_t > \lambda, \forall t \in [0, 4] \mid B_0 = \tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}, B_4 = \tilde{\eta}'_{N,y}), & \text{if } \tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}, \tilde{\eta}'_{N,y} > \lambda\,, \\ \mathbb{P}(B_t < -\lambda, \forall t \in [0, 4] \mid B_0 = \tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}, B_4 = \tilde{\eta}'_{N,y}), & \text{if } \tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}, \tilde{\eta}'_{N,y} < -\lambda\,, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the case when $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}, \tilde{\eta}'_{N,y} > \lambda$ (the other case is essentially the same), by the reflection principle we get that

$$1 - p_e = \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}+\tilde{\eta}'_{N,y}-2\lambda)^2}{16}} / \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}-\tilde{\eta}'_{N,y})^2}{16}} = \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{4}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}-\lambda)(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,y}-\lambda)}\,.$$

Therefore, conditioning on $\{\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v})^2 = \ell_v\}_{v\in V_N}$, we have $(1_{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)}>\lambda \text{ or } \tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)}<-\lambda})_{e\in E_N}$ is stochastically dominated by independent Bernoulli's with mean p'_e's, where

$$p'_e = \begin{cases} 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{4}(\sqrt{2\ell_x}-\lambda)(\sqrt{2\ell_y}-\lambda)}, & \text{if } \ell_x, \ell_y > \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\,, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, conditioning on $\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^v_{1/2} = \ell_v\}_{v\in V_N}$, the graph of $\mathcal{L}_{1/2,N}$ has the same law as $(1_{n_e>0})_{e\in E_N}$, where $(n_e)_{e\in E_N}$ follows the random current model (as in (3)) with parameters $\beta_e = 2\sqrt{\ell_x\ell_y}$ on edge $e = (x, y)$. Note that if we further condition on the parities of $(n_e)_{e\in E_N}$, then $n(e)$'s are independent with distribution F_{1,β_e} if $n(e)$ is odd and distribution F_{2,β_e} if $n(e)$ is even. Here F_{1,β_e} and F_{2,β_e} are both probability distributions on nonnegative integers such that

$$F_{1,\beta_e}(n) = \frac{(\beta_e)^n}{n!\sinh\beta_e} \text{ for } n = 1, 3, 5, \dots \text{ and } F_{2,\beta_e}(n) = \frac{(\beta_e)^n}{n!\cosh\beta_e} \text{ for } n = 0, 2, 4, \dots$$

This implies that, conditioning on $\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^v_{1/2} = \ell_v\}_{v\in V_N}$ and the parities of $(n_e)_{e\in E_N}$, $1_{n_e>0}$'s are independent Bernoulli variables with mean p''_e's, where $p''_e = 1$ if $n(e)$ is odd and $p''_e = 1 - 1/\cosh\beta_e$ if $n(e)$ is even. However, for $\ell_x, \ell_y > \frac{\lambda^2}{2}$ and $\lambda \geqslant 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1/\cosh\beta_e \leqslant 2/\mathrm{e}^{\beta_e} &= 2/\mathrm{e}^{2\sqrt{\ell_x\ell_y}} \\ &\leqslant \mathrm{e}^{-\sqrt{\ell_x\ell_y}} \\ &\leqslant \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{4}(\sqrt{2\ell_x}-\lambda)(\sqrt{2\ell_y}-\lambda)} = 1 - p'_e\,. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, conditioning on $\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}^v_{1/2} = \ell_v\}_{v\in V_N}$, we have $(1_{n_e>0})_{e\in E_N}$ stochastically dominates independent Bernoulli's with mean p'_e's.

Combining the above two parts completes the proof of the lemma. □

In light of Lemma 4.1, define (for $> \lambda$, the definition for $< -\lambda$ is similar)

$$D_{\tilde{\eta}'_N, E_N(1),>\lambda}(u, v) = \min_{\gamma} |\gamma|\,,$$

where the minimum is over all path $\gamma \subseteq V_N \cup E_N(1) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$ joining u and v such that $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,x} > \lambda$ for all $x \in \gamma$. In order to prove Theorem 1.3, it suffices to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2. *For any $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all N*

$$\mathbb{P}(\min\{D_{\tilde{\eta}'_N, E_N(1),>\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}), D_{\tilde{\eta}'_N, E_N(1),<-\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N})\} \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}) \geqslant c\,.$$

Proof. For the rigor of proof (when applying e.g., FKG inequality later), we will consider the following discrete approximation of the exploration procedure. We let $\Pi_N = (V_N \cup E_N(1)) \cap \frac{1}{N^3}\mathbb{Z}^2$

be an N^3-discretization of $V_N \cup E_N(1)$. In particular, we will only examine the values of $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}$ for $v \in \Pi_N$ in the following exploration procedure. Initially we set

$$\mathcal{A}_0^{>\lambda} = \{v \in \partial V_{\alpha N} : \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} > \lambda + \frac{1}{N}\}, \quad \mathcal{A}_0^{<-\lambda} = \{v \in \partial V_{\alpha N} : \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} < -\lambda - \frac{1}{N}\},$$
$$\mathcal{B}_0 = \{v \in \partial V_{\alpha N} : |\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}| \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N}\}, \quad \mathcal{C}_0^{>\lambda} = \mathcal{A}_0^{>\lambda}, \quad \mathcal{C}_0^{<-\lambda} = \mathcal{A}_0^{<-\lambda}.$$

For $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, at stage $(i+1)$, we run the exploration procedure as follows:

- We set initially $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{>\lambda} = \mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{<-\lambda} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{B}_{i+1}^{=\lambda} = \mathcal{B}_{i+1}^{=-\lambda} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{>\lambda} = \mathcal{C}_i^{>\lambda}$, $\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{<-\lambda} = \mathcal{C}_i^{<-\lambda}$.
- If $\mathcal{A}_i^{>\lambda} = \emptyset$, stop. Otherwise, for each $v \in \mathcal{A}_i^{>\lambda}$ and every edge $e(1) = (v, u) \in E_N(1)$ incident to v, if $u \in V_N \setminus V_{\alpha N}$ and the neighborhood of v along $e(1)$ does not belong to $\mathcal{C}_i^{>\lambda}$, we go (explore) from v along $e(1)$ to u until we reach a point $w \in \Pi_N$ with $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,w} \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N}$. In the case no such w is reached, we add all the points in $e(1) \cap \Pi_N$ (including v and u) into $\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{>\lambda}$ and add u, if it is not already in $\cup_{j=0}^{i} \mathcal{A}_j^{>\lambda}$, into $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{>\lambda}$; in the case that the first such $w \in \Pi_N$ is reached on $e(1)$, we add w into $\mathcal{B}_{i+1}^{=\lambda}$, and add all the points in $e(1) \cap \Pi_N$ between v and w (but not w) into $\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{>\lambda}$.
- We employ a similar procedure for the version of $< -\lambda$.

Let $\Lambda_{\text{bad}} = \{\sup_{v \in V_N} |\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}| \geqslant 100 \log N\}$ be as before. Define

$$\Lambda_c = \{|\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} - \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}| \leqslant \frac{1}{N}, \forall e(1) \in E_N(1) \text{ and } u, v \in e(1) \text{ such that } |u - v| \leqslant \frac{1}{N^3}\}. \tag{28}$$

Since conditioning on $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} : v \in V_N\}$, we have $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,e(1)} : e(1) = (x, y) \in E_N(1)\}$ are independent variance 2 Brownian bridges (which are Hölder continuous of any order less than 1/2) of length 4 with values $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}$ and $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,y}$ at the endpoints, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_c) \geqslant \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{\text{bad}}^c)(1 - o_N(1)) = 1 - o_N(1). \tag{29}$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{\min\{D_{\tilde{\eta}'_N, E_N(1), >\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N}), D_{\tilde{\eta}'_N, E_N(1), <-\lambda}(\partial V_{\alpha N}, \partial V_{\beta N})\} > N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}\}.$$

Suppose that both events $\mathcal{E}$ and Λ_c occur, then by (28) we must have that $\mathcal{C}_i^{>\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{C}_i^{<-\lambda}$ are both disjoint from $V_N \setminus V_{\beta N}$ for all $0 \leqslant i < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$. Further, since all of the $\mathcal{A}_i^{>\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{A}_i^{<-\lambda}$ where $0 \leqslant i < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ are disjoint from each other, we see that there exists at least an $i_0 < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ such that

$$|\mathcal{A}_{i_0}^{>\lambda} \cup \mathcal{A}_{i_0}^{<-\lambda}| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}. \tag{30}$$

Moreover (still on the event $\mathcal{E} \cap \Lambda_c$), for all $1 \leqslant i < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$, we have by (28) again

$$\lambda < \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{B}_i^{=\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad -\lambda - \frac{1}{N} \leqslant \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} < -\lambda \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{B}_i^{=-\lambda}.$$

It is clear that for any $k \geqslant 0$, from $\mathcal{C}_k^{>\lambda} = C_k^{>\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{C}_k^{<-\lambda} = C_k^{<-\lambda}$ we can determine (uniquely) the sets $\mathcal{A}_i^{>\lambda}, \mathcal{A}_i^{<-\lambda}, \mathcal{B}_i^{=\lambda}, \mathcal{B}_i^{=-\lambda}$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$ as well as $\mathcal{B}_0$. We denote them as

$A_i^{>\lambda}, A_i^{<-\lambda}, B_i^{=\lambda}, B_i^{=-\lambda}$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$ and B_0, respectively. They are all functions of $C_k^{>\lambda}$ and $C_k^{<-\lambda}$. We let $\mathcal{P}_k$ denote all $(C_k^{>\lambda}, C_k^{<-\lambda})$ such that $C_k^{>\lambda}$ and $C_k^{<-\lambda}$ are both disjoint from $V_N \setminus V_{\beta N}$, and such that

$$\min\{i_0 : |A_{i_0}^{>\lambda} \cup A_{i_0}^{<-\lambda}| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}\} = k\,. \tag{31}$$

In summary of the discussions above, we have

$$\mathcal{E} \cap \Lambda_c \subseteq \bigsqcup_{\substack{0\leqslant k<N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}} \\ (C_k^{>\lambda}, C_k^{<-\lambda})\in\mathcal{P}_k}} \mathcal{E}_{C_k^{>\lambda}, C_k^{<-\lambda}} \tag{32}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{C_k^{>\lambda}, C_k^{<-\lambda}} = \{&\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} > \lambda + \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in C_k^{>\lambda}, \quad \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} < -\lambda - \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in C_k^{<-\lambda}, \\ &\lambda < \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in \cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda},\ -\lambda - \frac{1}{N} \leqslant \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} < -\lambda \text{ for all } v \in \cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda}, \\ &|\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}| \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in B_0\}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Denote $I_k \triangleq B_0 \cup (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda}) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda}) \cup C_k^{>\lambda} \cup C_k^{<-\lambda}$. Then (33) above is $\mathcal{F}_{I_k}$ measurable. Conditioning on $\mathcal{F}_{I_k}$, the field $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} : u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N \setminus I_k\}$ is distributed as a GFF with boundary condition $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} : v \in I_k\}$ and zero on ∂V_N. In particular, for each $u \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} \mid \mathcal{F}_{I_k}) = \sum_{v\in I_k} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, v; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}\,. \tag{34}$$

Here $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, v; K)$ denotes the harmonic measure of $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ at v with respect to starting point u and target set K.

From the definition of our exploration procedure, we know that for any $u \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$, we have $\{v \in I_k : \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, v; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \neq 0\} \subseteq J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_3 \cup J_4$, which can be described as follows.

- $J_1 = B_0$.
- $J_2 = (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda}) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda})$.
- For each $v \in J_3$, we have $v \in A_i^{>\lambda}$ (or $v \in A_i^{<-\lambda}$ respectively) for some $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, and on an edge $e(1) = (v, v') \in E_N(1)$ there is a $w \in B_{i+1}^{=\lambda}$ (or $w \in B_{i+1}^{=-\lambda}$ respectively). In particular, each $v \in J_3$ must satisfy that $v \in V_N$ and that v has Euclidean distance less than 1 to a point $w \in J_2$.
- $J_4 = A_k^{>\lambda} \cup A_k^{<-\lambda}$.

Define

$$X = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{u\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}\,.$$

Further define

$$X_1 = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{u\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{v\in J_1} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, v; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}\,,$$

$$X_2 = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{u \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{v \in J_2} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, v; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \,,$$

$$X_3 = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{u \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{v \in J_3} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, v; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \,,$$

$$X_4 = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{u \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{v \in J_4} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, v; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \,.$$

Then by (34), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{I_k}) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4 \,.$$

It is clear that $|X_1| \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N}$ and $|X_2| \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N}$ always hold. Let $D_k = (\cup_{i=0}^k A_i^{>\lambda}) \cup (\cup_{i=0}^k A_i^{<-\lambda}) \cup B_0$ be the set of all the lattice points in I_k. Then $J_4 \subseteq D_k \subseteq I_k$, so that

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, J_4; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \leqslant \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, J_4; D_k \cup \partial V_N) \,. \tag{35}$$

Since $|J_4| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}$ by (31), we have by (21)

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, J_4; D_k \cup \partial V_N) = \mathrm{Hm}(u, J_4; D_k \cup \partial V_N) = o(\log N)^{-10} \,,$$

and therefore $\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(u, J_4; I_k \cup \partial V_N) = o(\log N)^{-10}$. Recall that $\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}} = \{\sup_{v \in V_N} |\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}| \geqslant 100 \log N\}$. Then if the event Λ_{bad} does not occur, we have $|X_4| = o(\log N)^{-8}$.

It now remains to control X_3 on the event $\mathcal{E}_{C_k^{>\lambda}, C_k^{<-\lambda}}$. To be more precise, we consider any fixed $\{x_{N,v}\}_{v \in B_0 \cup (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda}) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda})}$ such that

$$|x_{N,v}| \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in B_0, \quad \lambda < x_{N,v} \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda},$$

$$-\lambda - \frac{1}{N} \leqslant x_{N,v} < -\lambda \text{ for all } v \in \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda} \,.$$

We define three events $H_=, H_+, H_-$ as follows:

- $H_= = \{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} = x_{N,v} \text{ for all } v \in B_0 \cup (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda}) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda})\}$;
- $H_+ = \{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} > \lambda + \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in C_k^{>\lambda}\}$;
- $H_- = \{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} < -\lambda - \frac{1}{N} \text{ for all } v \in C_k^{<-\lambda}\}$.

We will show that conditioning on $H_= \cap H_- \cap H_+$, we have

(a) $\mathbb{E}(X_3 \mid H_=, H_+, H_-) \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} + C_0$ where C_0 is a constant;

(b) $\mathrm{Var}(X_3 \mid H_=, H_+, H_-) = o_N(1)$ (where we use $o_N(1)$ to denote a quantity that only depends on N and tends to 0 as $N \to \infty$).

As a corollary of (a) and (b), conditioning on $\{H_=, H_+, H_-\}$, we have X_3 itself is bounded from above by $\lambda+C_0+1$ with probability $(1-o_N(1))$. By integrating over all $\{x_{N,v}\}_{v\in B_0\cup(\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda})\cup(\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda})}$, we see that there exists a $\mathcal{F}_{I_k}$ measurable event $\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}$ such that on the event $\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}} \setminus \Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}$, we have $\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{I_k})$ is bounded from above by a constant Δ, and moreover

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}) \geqslant (1-o_N(1))\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}})\,. \tag{36}$$

Now on the event $\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}\setminus\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}$, we have $\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{I_k}) \leqslant \Delta$ and $\operatorname{Var} X - \operatorname{Var}(X \mid \mathcal{F}_{I_k}) \geqslant c_{11} > 0$ by (27) (also recall that $\operatorname{Var} X \leqslant c_4$ by (8)). Let $t = \Delta + s\sqrt{\operatorname{Var} X - c_{11}}$. Then on the event $\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}} \setminus \Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leqslant t \mid \mathcal{F}_{I_k}) \geqslant \mathbb{P}(Z(\Delta, \operatorname{Var} X - c_{11}) \leqslant t) = \mathbb{P}(Z \leqslant s)\,,$$

where $Z(\Delta, \operatorname{Var} X - c_{11})$ is a Gaussian variable with mean Δ and variance $\operatorname{Var} X - c_{11}$, and Z is a standard Gaussian variable. Therefore (since $\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}$ is $\mathcal{F}_{I_k}$ measurable)

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leqslant t, \mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(X \leqslant t \mid \mathcal{F}_{I_k})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}}) \geqslant \mathbb{P}(Z \leqslant s)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}} \setminus \Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}})\,.$$

Summing this over all $0 \leqslant k < N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}$ and all $(C_k^{>\lambda}, C_k^{<-\lambda}) \in \mathcal{P}_k$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leqslant t) \geqslant \mathbb{P}(Z \leqslant s)\mathbb{P}((\bigsqcup_{\substack{0\leqslant k<N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}\\(C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda})\in\mathcal{P}_k}} \mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}) \setminus \Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}})\,.$$

Therefore, for a sufficiently large constant $s > 0$ and a constant $c' > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\bigsqcup_{\substack{0\leqslant k<N\mathrm{e}^{(\log N)^{9/10}}\\(C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda})\in\mathcal{P}_k}} \mathcal{E}'_{C_k^{>\lambda},C_k^{<-\lambda}}) \leqslant \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leqslant t)}{\mathbb{P}(Z \leqslant s)} + \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{bad}}) \leqslant 1 - c'\,.$$

Combined with (36), (32) and (29), this gives us the result of the proposition.

It remains to prove (a) and (b), which are incorporated in Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 below. □

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for any $v \in J_3$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \mid H_=, H_+, H_-) \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} + C_0\,.$$

Proof. If for some $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, $v \in A_i^{<-\lambda}$, then clearly we have $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \mid H_=, H_+, H_-) \leqslant -\lambda - \frac{1}{N} \leqslant \lambda + \frac{1}{N} + C_0$. So in what follows we assume that for some $0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, $v \in A_i^{>\lambda}$ and on an edge $e(1) = (v, v') \in E_N(1)$ there is a $w \in B_{i+1}^{=\lambda}$. This type of argument is known as the entropic repulsion estimates in the presence of a hard wall [21, 4]. Our context is close to [21] with some slight complication, and our proof essentially follows from the same line of arguments.

First of all, we claim that there exist a function $f(u)$ defined on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$ and absolute constants $C, C_1 > 0$ that can be taken to be arbitrarily large, such that $f(u)$ is harmonic on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N \setminus \{w\}$, i.e., $f(u)|_{u\in V_N\cup\{w\}}$ is harmonic on the discrete graph $(V_N \cup \{w\}, E'_{N,w})$ except at w, and $f(u)$ is linear

on each segment $e' \in E'_{N,w}$, where $E'_{N,w} = \{e' : e' \in E_N(1) \cup E_N(2) \text{ and } w \notin e'\} \cup \{(v,w),(w,v')\}$. In addition, we have that

$$|f(u) - C\log(|u-w|+2) - C_1| \leqslant L(C) \quad \text{ for all } u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\,, \tag{37}$$

where $L(C)$ is a function that only depends on C. In particular, we take $C_1 > L(C)$ so that $f(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$.

Indeed, by [21, (B17)] or [30, Theorem 4.4.4], there exist a function $g(u)$ defined on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and absolute constants $C, C'_1 > 0$ that can be taken to be arbitrarily large, such that $g(u)$ is harmonic on $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ and $|g(u) - C\log(|u|+2) - C'_1| \leqslant L'(C)$ for all $u \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ (where $L'(C)$ is a function that only depends on C). Now let us define for $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} |v'-w|g(u-v) + |v-w|g(u-v'), & \text{if } u \in V_N\,, \\ f(w), & \text{if } u = w\,, \\ \text{linear interpolation between } f(x) \text{ and } f(y), & \text{if } u \in e' = (x,y) \in E'_{N,w}\,, \end{cases}$$

where

$$f(w) = (|v-w|^2 + |v'-w|^2)g((0,0)) - 8|v-w||v'-w|Dg((0,0)) + |v-w||v'-w|(g(v'-v)+g(v-v'))$$

and

$$Dg((0,0)) = g((0,1)) + g((0,-1)) + g((1,0)) + g((-1,0)) - 4g((0,0))\,.$$

Then by definition, $f(u)$ is clearly harmonic on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N \setminus \{v, v', w\}$. To show that it is also harmonic at v and v', we have to verify that

$$(3 + \frac{7}{8} + \frac{1}{8|v-w|})f(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} f(v_i) + \frac{7}{8}f(v') + \frac{1}{8|v-w|}f(w)$$

and

$$(3 + \frac{7}{8} + \frac{1}{8|v'-w|})f(v') = \sum_{i=1}^{3} f(v'_i) + \frac{7}{8}f(v) + \frac{1}{8|v'-w|}f(w)$$

where $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in V_N$ are the three neighbors of v other than v', and $v'_1, v'_2, v'_3 \in V_N$ are the three neighbors of v' other than v. We give the details for verification of the first identity (the second one is similar) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{3} f(v_i) + \frac{7}{8}f(v') + \frac{1}{8|v-w|}f(w) \\ = \; & \sum_{i=1}^{3}(|v'-w|g(v_i-v) + |v-w|g(v_i-v')) + \frac{7}{8}(|v'-w|g(v'-v) + |v-w|g((0,0))) + \frac{1}{8|v-w|}f(w) \\ = \; & |v'-w|(Dg((0,0)) + 4g((0,0)) - g(v'-v)) + |v-w|(4g(v-v') - g((0,0))) \\ & + \frac{7}{8}(|v'-w|g(v'-v) + |v-w|g((0,0))) + \frac{1}{8|v-w|}f(w) \\ = \; & (3 + \frac{7}{8} + \frac{1}{8|v-w|})(|v'-w|g((0,0)) + |v-w|g(v-v')) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \quad (3+\frac{7}{8}+\frac{1}{8|v-w|})f(v)\,,$$

where the penultimate equality follows by comparing the coefficients of $g((0,0))$, $Dg((0,0))$, $g(v'-v)$ and $g(v-v')$. For completeness, we record the detailed computations on these coefficients here:

$$\begin{aligned}
g((0,0)): \qquad & 4|v'-w|+\frac{1}{8|v-w|}|v'-w|^2-(3+\frac{7}{8}+\frac{1}{8|v-w|})|v'-w| \\
= \quad & |v'-w|(4+\frac{1-|v-w|}{8|v-w|}-(3+\frac{7}{8}+\frac{1}{8|v-w|}))=0 \\
& \text{and } -|v-w|+\frac{7}{8}|v-w|+\frac{1}{8|v-w|}|v-w|^2=0\,; \\
Dg((0,0)): \qquad & |v'-w|+\frac{1}{8|v-w|}(-8|v-w||v'-w|)=0\,; \\
g(v'-v): \qquad & -|v'-w|+\frac{7}{8}|v'-w|+\frac{1}{8|v-w|}|v-w||v'-w|=0\,; \\
g(v-v'): \qquad & 4|v-w|+\frac{1}{8|v-w|}|v-w||v'-w|-(3+\frac{7}{8}+\frac{1}{8|v-w|})|v-w| \\
= \quad & |v-w|(4+\frac{1-|v-w|}{8|v-w|}-(3+\frac{7}{8}+\frac{1}{8|v-w|})) \\
= \quad & 0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we completed the verification that $f(u)$ is harmonic on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\setminus\{w\}$, and (37) follows easily from our definition of $f(u)$.

We now claim that

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}\mid H_=,H_+,H_-)\leqslant\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}\mid \tilde{\eta}'_{N,w}=f(w)+\lambda+\frac{1}{N},\ \tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}=f(u)+\lambda+\frac{1}{N}\ \forall u\in\partial V_N,\ \tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}>\lambda+\frac{1}{N}\ \forall u\in\Pi_N\setminus\{w\})\,. \quad (38)$$

To show this, we follow [24, Appendix B.1]. We observe that $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}: u\in\Pi_N\cup\partial V_N\}$ is a Gaussian free field indexed on a finite set (here we have actually added an artificial site o, connected it to ∂V_N, and conditioned on $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,o}=0$). In particular, its law μ has density $\mu(\,dr)=\exp(-H(r))\,dr$ (here $r=(r_u)_{u\in\Pi_N\cup\partial V_N}$ denotes a general $|\Pi_N|+|\partial V_N|$ dimensional vector) such that for every $r,r'\in\mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_N|+|\partial V_N|}$

$$H(r\vee r')+H(r\wedge r')\leqslant H(r)+H(r')\,.$$

For $k>0$, we define

$$U^{(k)}(t)=\begin{cases}kt^4, & \text{if } t<0\\ 0, & \text{if } t\geqslant 0\end{cases}\,,\quad V^{(k)}(t)=\begin{cases}0, & \text{if } t<0\\ kt^4, & \text{if } t\geqslant 0\end{cases}\,,\quad W^{(k)}(t)=kt^4 \quad (39)$$

and

$$\mu_1^{(k)}(\,dr)\propto\exp(-\sum_{u\in B_0\cup(\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=\lambda})\cup(\cup_{i=1}^k B_i^{=-\lambda})}W^{(k)}(r_u-x_{N,u})-\sum_{u\in C_k^{>\lambda}}U^{(k)}(r_u-\lambda-\frac{1}{N})$$

$$- \sum_{u \in C_k^{<-\lambda}} V^{(k)}(r_u + \lambda + \frac{1}{N}) - \sum_{u \in \partial V_N} W^{(k)}(r_u)) \mu(\, dr)\,,$$

$$\mu_2^{(k)}(\, dr) \propto \exp(\, - \sum_{u \in \{w\} \cup \partial V_N} W^{(k)}(r_u - f(u) - \lambda - \frac{1}{N}) - \sum_{u \in \Pi_N \setminus \{w\}} U^{(k)}(r_u - \lambda - \frac{1}{N}))\mu(\, dr)\,.$$

It is not hard to verify that for any real numbers $t_0 < t_1$ and any pair of functions

$$(h_1(t), h_2(t)) \in \{(W^{(k)}(t - t_0), W^{(k)}(t - t_1)), (W^{(k)}(t - t_0), U^{(k)}(t - t_0)), (V^{(k)}(t - t_0), U^{(k)}(t - t_0)),$$
$$(0, U^{(k)}(t - t_0)), (U^{(k)}(t - t_0), U^{(k)}(t - t_1))\}\,,$$

we have for every $t, t' \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$h_2(t \vee t') + h_1(t \wedge t') \leqslant h_2(t) + h_1(t')\,,$$

and therefore for any $k > 0$, $\mu_2^{(k)}$ dominates $\mu_1^{(k)}$ in the strong FKG sense ($\mu_1^{(k)} \overset{S}{\prec} \mu_2^{(k)}$), i.e., we have $\mu_1^{(k)}(\, dr) = \exp(-H_1^{(k)}(r))\, dr$, $\mu_2^{(k)}(\, dr) = \exp(-H_2^{(k)}(r))\, dr$ and for every r, r'

$$H_2^{(k)}(r \vee r') + H_1^{(k)}(r \wedge r') \leqslant H_2^{(k)}(r) + H_1^{(k)}(r')\,.$$

It follows that $\mu_2^{(k)}$ dominates $\mu_1^{(k)}$ in the FKG sense ($\mu_1^{(k)} \prec \mu_2^{(k)}$), i.e., $\mu_1^{(k)}$ is stochastically smaller than $\mu_2^{(k)}$. As $k \to \infty$, $\mu_1^{(k)}$ and $\mu_2^{(k)}$ will converge weakly to the conditional laws on the left and right hand sides of (38), respectively. Therefore (38) is verified.

Clearly, the right hand side of (38) equals

$$\lambda + \frac{1}{N} + \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,w} = f(w),\ \tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} = f(u)\ \forall u \in \partial V_N}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \mid \tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} > 0 \text{ for all } u \in \Pi_N \setminus \{w\})\,.$$

Denote by M the boundary condition $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,w} = f(w)$, $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} = f(u)\ \forall u \in \partial V_N$. Now under M, for any $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$, we have $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}$ is Gaussian with mean $\mathbb{E}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}) = f(u)$ and variance $\mathrm{Var}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}) = G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N \setminus \{w\}}(u, u)$. It is well known that there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that $G_{V_N \setminus \{v\}}(u, u) \leqslant C_2 \log(|u - v| + 2)$ for all $u \in V_N$. Therefore we have for all $u \in V_N$,

$$\mathrm{Var}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}) = G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N \setminus \{w\}}(u, u) \leqslant 32(1 + G_{V_N \setminus \{v\}}(u, u)) \leqslant 32(1 + C_2 \log(|u - v| + 2))\,. \tag{40}$$

In particular, for $u = v$ we have the following bound (using (37) and (40))

$$\mathbb{E}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} > 0 \text{ for all } u \in \Pi_N \setminus \{w\}}) \leqslant \mathbb{E}_M(|\tilde{\eta}'_{N,v}|) \leqslant C_3\,, \tag{41}$$

where C_3 is a positive constant which only depends on C and C_1.

It now remains to lower bound $\mathbb{P}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} > 0 \text{ for all } u \in \Pi_N \setminus \{w\})$. We will do this by giving a lower bound of $\mathbb{P}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} > 0 \text{ for all } u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N \setminus \{w\})$. First, by a union bound over all $u \in V_N$ and using the bounds in (37) and (40), we have (first take C, then C_1 to be sufficiently large)

$$\mathbb{P}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} \geqslant f(u)/2 \text{ for all } u \in V_N) \geqslant 1/2\,. \tag{42}$$

Conditioning on the values $\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u}$ for all $u \in V_N$, for each segment $e' = (x, y) \in E'_{N,w}$, we have (here $d(x, y)$ denotes the distance between x and y in the metric graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$)

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} = 0 \text{ for some } u \in e' \mid M, \mathcal{F}_{V_N}) = \mathrm{e}^{-\tilde{\eta}'_{N,x}\tilde{\eta}'_{N,y} \cdot \frac{1}{d(x,y)}} \leqslant \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{16} f(x) f(y)}$$

on the event $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} \geqslant f(u)/2 \text{ for all } u \in V_N\}$. By another union bound over all segments $e' \in E'_{N,w}$ and using (37), we have on the same event,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} > 0 \text{ for all } u \in e' \text{ and all } e' \in E'_{N,w} \mid M, \mathcal{F}_{V_N}) \geqslant 1/2\,. \tag{43}$$

Combining (42) and (43) we have $\mathbb{P}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} > 0 \text{ for all } u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N \setminus \{w\}) \geqslant 1/4$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{P}_M(\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} > 0 \text{ for all } u \in \Pi_N \setminus \{w\}) \geqslant 1/4\,. \tag{44}$$

Combining (38), (41) and (44), we see that we can take $C_0 = 4C_3$ and we completed the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 4.4. *There exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that*

$$\mathrm{Var}(X_3 \mid H_=, H_+, H_-) \leqslant \frac{C_4}{\log N}\,.$$

Proof. We first claim that

$$\mathrm{Var}(X_3 \mid H_=, H_+, H_-) \leqslant \mathrm{Var}(X_3 \mid H_=) = \mathrm{Var}(X_3 \mid \mathcal{F}_{J_1 \cup J_2})\,. \tag{45}$$

To show this, we use the Brascamp-Lieb inequalities (see, e.g., [24, Appendix B.2]). Denote by μ the law of Z where Z is distributed as $\{\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} : u \in \Pi_N \setminus (J_1 \cup J_2)\}$ conditioned on $H_=$. Then Z is a finite dimensional Gaussian vector. Let m and A be its mean vector and covariance matrix, respectively. The density of μ is of the form $\mu(\,dr) \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(r-m)\cdot A^{-1}(r-m))\,dr$. For any $k > 0$, consider the measure

$$\mu^{(k)}(\,dr) \propto \exp(-\sum_{u \in C_k^{>\lambda}} U^{(k)}(r_u - \lambda - \frac{1}{N}) - \sum_{u \in C_k^{<-\lambda}} V^{(k)}(r_u + \lambda + \frac{1}{N}))\mu(\,dr)\,,$$

where $U^{(k)}$ and $V^{(k)}$ are as defined in (39). Since the second order derivatives of $U^{(k)}$ and $V^{(k)}$ are both nonnegative, we see that the density of $\mu^{(k)}$ is of the form $\mu^{(k)}(\,dr) = \exp(-H(r))\,dr$ where $\inf_r \mathrm{Hess}(H)(r) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}A^{-1}$. Therefore, by the Brascamp-Lieb inequality, for the random vector $Y^{(k)} \sim \mu^{(k)}$ and for every $l \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_N \setminus (J_1 \cup J_2)|}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}(l \cdot Y^{(k)}) \leqslant \mathrm{Var}(l \cdot Z)\,.$$

Since as $k \to \infty$, the law of $Y^{(k)}$ (i.e. $\mu^{(k)}$) converges weakly to the law of Z conditioned on H_+ and H_-, we see that

$$\mathrm{Var}(l \cdot Z \mid H_+, H_-) \leqslant \mathrm{Var}(l \cdot Z)\,.$$

Note that

$$\mathrm{Var}(X_3 \mid H_=, H_+, H_-) = \mathrm{Var}(\frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{u \in J_3} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v, u; I_k \cup \partial V_N) \cdot \tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} \mid H_=, H_+, H_-)\,.$$

Thus, by setting $l_u = \frac{1}{|\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}|} \sum_{v \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v, u; I_k \cup \partial V_N)$ for $u \in J_3$ and 0 otherwise, this gives the inequality (45).

Now let us define

$$U_1 = \{u_1 \in J_3 : |u_1 - u| \geqslant (\log N)^{10} \text{ for all } u \in J_4\}$$

and for $u_1 \in U_1$, define

$$U_2(u_1) = \{u_2 \in J_3 : |u_1 - u_2| \geqslant (\log N)^{10}\}\,.$$

For $u_1, u_2 \in J_3$, we say a pair (u_1, u_2) is good if $u_1 \in U_1$ and $u_2 \in U_2(u_1)$. We can expand the right hand side of (45) as follows (where we write $\mathcal{I}_{k,N} = I_k \cup \partial V_N$):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Var}\Big(\sum_{v\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{u\in J_3} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v,u;\mathcal{I}_{k,N})\cdot\tilde{\eta}'_{N,u} \mid \mathcal{F}_{J_1\cup J_2}\Big)\\
=\ &\sum_{v_1,v_2\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{u_1\in J_3\setminus U_1} \sum_{u_2\in J_3} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_1,u_1;\mathcal{I}_{k,N})\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_2,u_2;\mathcal{I}_{k,N}) G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\setminus(J_1\cup J_2)}(u_1,u_2)\\
&+\sum_{v_1,v_2\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{u_1\in U_1} \sum_{u_2\in J_3\setminus U_2(u_1)} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_1,u_1;\mathcal{I}_{k,N})\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_2,u_2;\mathcal{I}_{k,N}) G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\setminus(J_1\cup J_2)}(u_1,u_2)\\
&+\sum_{v_1,v_2\in\partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}} \sum_{(u_1,u_2)\text{ is good}} \widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_1,u_1;\mathcal{I}_{k,N})\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_2,u_2;\mathcal{I}_{k,N}) G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\setminus(J_1\cup J_2)}(u_1,u_2)\,. \quad (46)
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that we have $|J_4| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}$. By a simple volume consideration, we have $|J_3\setminus U_1| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}(\log N)^{21}$ and for $u_1 \in U_1$, $|J_3 \setminus U_2(u_1)| \leqslant N\mathrm{e}^{-(\log N)^{9/10}}(\log N)^{21}$. Therefore, for any $v_1, v_2 \in \partial V_{(1+\beta)N/2}$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_1, J_3 \setminus U_1; I_k \cup \partial V_N) = o(\log N)^{-10} \quad (47)$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Hm}}'(v_2, J_3 \setminus U_2(u_1); I_k \cup \partial V_N) = o(\log N)^{-10}\,. \quad (48)$$

It is well known that for a constant $C_5 > 0$, we have for any $u_1, u_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N$

$$G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\setminus(J_1\cup J_2)}(u_1,u_2) \leqslant G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}(u_1,u_2) \leqslant C_5 \log N\,. \quad (49)$$

We claim that there exists a constant $C_6 > 0$, such that if (u_1, u_2) is good, then

$$G_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N\setminus(J_1\cup J_2)}(u_1,u_2) \leqslant \frac{C_6}{\log N}\,. \quad (50)$$

We will show that if $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ is started at u_1, then the probability that it goes $(\log N)^{10}$ away from u_1 before hitting $J_1 \cup J_2$ is, say, less than $\frac{C_7}{(\log N)^2}$ for a constant $C_7 > 0$. Since $|u_1 - u_2| \geqslant (\log N)^{10}$, and the expected number of visits of u_2 by $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ is by (49) at most $C_5 \log N$, we see that (50) is valid with $C_6 = C_7C_5$.

To do this, we use the Beurling's estimate (see, e.g., [30, Theorem 6.8.1]). We observe that $J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_4$ (as the "outer boundary" of I_k) is a $*$-connected set (where we regard two vertices as neighboring each other if their ℓ_1-distance is at most 1) with diameter of order N, in the sense that

$$V \triangleq \{v \in V_N : |v - u| \leqslant 1 \text{ for some } u \in J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_4\}$$

is a connected set with diameter of order N. In particular, by the definition of J_3 we have $J_3 \subseteq V$. By Beurling's estimate, once $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ is at $v \in V$, it will hit V again before going $(\log N)^6$ away from v, with probability at least $1 - \frac{C_8}{(\log N)^3}$ (where $C_8 > 0$ is an absolute constant). Thus, if $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ is started at $u_1 \in J_3$, then with probability at least $1 - \frac{C_8}{(\log N)^2}$, it will hit V at least $\log N$ times, before going $(\log N)^7$ away from u_1. However, it is clear that if $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ is at $v \in V$, then it has at least constant probability ($\geqslant 1/32$) to hit $J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_4$ before (or at) hitting a neighbor of v. Therefore, at these $\log N$ times that $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ hits V (before going $(\log N)^7$ away from u_1), it has at least $1 - \frac{1}{N^{\log \frac{32}{31}}}$ probability to hit $J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_4$ at least once in the following step, and since J_4 is $(\log N)^{10}$ away from u_1, it must hit $J_1 \cup J_2$. That is to say, the probability that $B^{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_N}$ hits $J_1 \cup J_2$ before going $(\log N)^{10}$ away from u_1 is at least $(1 - \frac{C_8}{(\log N)^2})(1 - \frac{1}{N^{\log \frac{32}{31}}})$, which is greater than $1 - \frac{C_7}{(\log N)^2}$ for any $C_7 > C_8$.

Now substituting the bounds in (47), (48) , (49) and (50) into (46) completes the proof of the lemma. □

Acknowledgement. We are most grateful to Greg Lawler for numerous stimulating discussions, including introducing the percolation problem on random walk loop soups and explaining his work on Makarov's theorem. We thank Marek Biskup for helpful discussions, intended for a different project but turned out relevant for the current article. We also thank Hubert Lacoin for helping locating [21]. As always, we thank Steve Lalley for his constant encouragement and support, and many useful discussions.

References

[1] M. Aizenman and A. Burchard. Hölder regularity and dimension bounds for random curves. *Duke Math. J.*, 99(3):419–453, 1999.

[2] M. Aizenman, H. Duminil-Copin, and V. Sidoravicius. Random currents and continuity of Ising model's spontaneous magnetization. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 334(2):719–742, 2015.

[3] R. F. Bass. *Probabilistic techniques in analysis*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[4] E. Bolthausen, J.-D. Deuschel, and G. Giacomin. Entropic repulsion and the maximum of the two-dimensional harmonic crystal. *Ann. Probab.*, 29(4):1670–1692, 2001.

[5] H. J. Brascamp and E. H. Lieb. On extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler theorems, including inequalities for log concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation. *J. Functional Analysis*, 22(4):366–389, 1976.

[6] K. Burdzy. My favorite open problems. See `www.math.washington.edu/~burdzy/open_mathjax.php`.

[7] L. Carleson. On the distortion of sets on a Jordan curve under conformal mapping. *Duke Math. J.*, 40:547–559, 1973.

[8] J. Černý and S. Popov. On the internal distance in the interlacement set. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 17:no. 29, 25, 2012.

[9] Y. Chang. Supercritical loop percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ for $d \geqslant 3$. Preprint, arXiv:1504.07906.

[10] Y. Chang and A. Sapozhnikov. Phase transition in loop percolation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 164, 2016.

[11] L. Chayes. Aspects of the fractal percolation process. In *Fractal geometry and stochastics (Finsterbergen, 1994)*, volume 37 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 113–143. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.

[12] L. Chayes. On the length of the shortest crossing in the super-critical phase of Mandelbrot's percolation process. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 61(1):25–43, 1996.

[13] M. Damron, J. Hanson, and P. Sosoe. On the chemical distance in critical percolation. Preprint, arXiv:1506.03461.

[14] M. Damron, J. Hanson, and P. Sosoe. On the chemical distance in critical percolation II. Preprint, arXiv:1601.03464.

[15] J. Ding. Asymptotics of cover times via Gaussian free fields: bounded-degree graphs and general trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 42(2):464–496, 2014.

[16] J. Ding and A. Dunlap. Liouville first passage percolation: subsequential scaling limits at high temperatures. Preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1605.04011`.

[17] J. Ding and S. Goswami. First passage percolation on the exponential of two-dimensional branching random walk. Preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06932`.

[18] J. Ding and S. Goswami. Liouville first passage percolation: the weight exponent is strictly less than 1 at high temperatures. Preprint, available at `https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.08392`.

[19] J. Ding and F. Zhang. Non-universality for first passage percolation on the exponential of log-correlated gaussian fields. Preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.03293`.

[20] A. Drewitz, B. Ráth, and A. Sapozhnikov. On chemical distances and shape theorems in percolation models with long-range correlations. *J. Math. Phys.*, 55(8):083307, 30, 2014.

[21] F. Dunlop, J. Magnen, V. Rivasseau, and P. Roche. Pinning of an interface by a weak potential. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 66(1):71–98, 1992.

[22] B. Duplantier, G. F. Lawler, J.-F. Le Gall, and T. J. Lyons. The geometry of the Brownian curve. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 117(1):91–106, 1993.

[23] C. M. Fortuin, P. W. Kasteleyn, and J. Ginibre. Correlation inequalities on some partially ordered sets. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 22:89–103, 1971.

[24] G. Giacomin. Aspects of statistical mechanics of random surfaces. *Notes of lectures given at IHP, fall*, 2001.

[25] H. Kesten. Hitting probabilities of random walks on $\mathbf{Z}^d$. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 25(2):165–184, 1987.

[26] G. Lawler. Loop measures and random currents. Draft, available at `http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~lawler/loop16.pdf`.

[27] G. F. Lawler. *Intersections of Random Walks*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, 1991.

[28] G. F. Lawler. A discrete analogue of a theorem of Makarov. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 2(2):181–199, 1993.

[29] G. F. Lawler and V. Limic. The Beurling estimate for a class of random walks. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 9:no. 27, 846–861 (electronic), 2004.

[30] G. F. Lawler and V. Limic. *Random walk: a modern introduction*, volume 123 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[31] G. F. Lawler and J. A. Trujillo Ferreras. Random walk loop soup. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(2):767–787 (electronic), 2007.

[32] G. F. Lawler and W. Werner. The Brownian loop soup. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 128(4):565–588, 2004.

[33] Y. Le Jan. *Markov paths, loops and fields*, volume 2026 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. Lectures from the 38th Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, 2008, École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour. [Saint-Flour Probability Summer School].

[34] T. Lupu. Loop percolation on discrete half-plane. Preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1408.1045`.

[35] T. Lupu. From loop clusters and random interlacements to the free field. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):2117–2146, 2016.

[36] T. Lupu and W. Werner. The random pseudo-metric on a graph defined via the zero-set of the gaussian free field on its metric graph. Preprint, available at `https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.06424`.

[37] T. Lupu and W. Werner. A note on Ising random currents, Ising-FK, loop-soups and the Gaussian free field. 2015. Preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.05524`.

[38] N. G. Makarov. On the distortion of boundary sets under conformal mappings. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 51(2):369–384, 1985.

[39] M. B. Marcus and J. Rosen. *Markov processes, Gaussian processes, and local times*, volume 100 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[40] J. E. McMillan and G. Piranian. Compression and expansion of boundary sets. *Duke Math. J.*, 40:599–605, 1973.

[41] M. E. Orzechowski. A lower bound on the box-counting dimension of crossings in fractal percolation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 74(1):53–65, 1998.

[42] C. J. Preston. A generalization of the FKG inequalities. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 36:233–241, 1974.

[43] P.-F. Rodriguez and A.-S. Sznitman. Phase transition and level-set percolation for the Gaussian free field. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 320(2):571–601, 2013.

[44] J. Rosen. Lectures on isomorphism theorems. Preprint, arXiv:1407.1559.

[45] S. Sheffield and W. Werner. Conformal loop ensembles: the Markovian characterization and the loop-soup construction. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(3):1827–1917, 2012.

[46] V. Sidoravicius and A.-S. Sznitman. Percolation for the vacant set of random interlacements. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(6):831–858, 2009.

[47] A.-S. Sznitman. Vacant set of random interlacements and percolation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(3):2039–2087, 2010.

[48] A.-S. Sznitman. *Topics in occupation times and Gaussian free fields*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2012.

[49] A.-S. Sznitman. Disconnection and level-set percolation for the Gaussian free field. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 67(4):1801–1843, 2015.

[50] W. Werner. On the spatial Markov property of soups of unoriented and oriented loops. 2015. Preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.03696`.

[51] A. Zhai. Exponential concentration of cover times. Preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1407.7617`.